



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

52
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,423	04/09/2004	Thomas H. Walters	702.345	1221
7590	04/26/2005		EXAMINER	
Devon A. Rolf GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC. 1200 East 151st Street Olathe, KS 66062			HERNANDEZ, OLGA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/821,423	WALTERS ET AL.
	Examiner Olga Hernandez	Art Unit 2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 and 23-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 17-22 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has added the limitation of the second device communicating to the first device, but separate from the first device. The devices perform the same functions making it functional equivalent independently of the constructed structures of the devices. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 2/10/05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

What is the applicant referring as "the one" in lines 4? Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turetzky et al (6,529,829).

As per claims 1 and 10, Turetzky teaches:

- providing a first handheld navigation device, the first navigation device and an integral display (column 4, lines 59-67);
- providing a second navigation device to communicate with the first navigation device, the second navigation device including one or more dead reckoning positioning components (column 4, lines 59-64 and column 3, lines 25-27);
- resolving a position of the first and the second navigation devices, wherein resolving the position includes using the one or more dead

reckoning positioning components to determine the position when the triangulation positioning functionality is interrupted (column 3, lines 38-42).

Turetzky does not mention the use of triangulation. However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that any navigation system needs at least three satellites (triangulation) to work properly in the position detection (applicant's disclosure –page 1, lines 27-28, page 2, lines 1-11, page 3, lines 18-22). Further it is obvious that the PDA used by the prior art has a display device.

As per claims 2 and 7, Turetzky teaches providing a handheld multifunction device selected from a group of a PDA enabled device and a cell phone enabled device (column 4, line 59-67).

As per claim 8, it is inherent for a navigation system to display the position of a device, which has the receiver.

As per claim 12, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that any related data is going to be from any vehicle that uses navigation system.

Claims 3, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turetzky et al (6,529,829) in view of Hakala et al (6,452,544).

As per claims 3 and 4, Turetzky does not teach the PDA having an integrated compass. However, Hakala teaches it in column 11, lines 21-23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in

order to provide a portable map viewing capable of indicating the current location of the user.

As per claim 5, neither, Turetzky nor Hakala teaches the portable device including a rate gyro. However, Hakala teaches the integrated compass that performs the same equivalent function. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute any means for another means in order to reduce costs.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turetzky et al (6,529,829) in view of Horvitz et al (6,601,012).

Turetzky does not teach-the PDA having-an accelerometer. However, Horvitz teaches it in column 10, lines 40-44. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to provide a portable map viewing capable of indicating the current location of the user.

Claims 9, 13-16, 23-32, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turetzky et al (6,529,829) in view of DeLorme et al (6,321,1584).

As per claims 9 ands 34, Turetzky does not teach the PDA performing a route calculation. However, DeLorme teaches it in abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in

order to provide a portable map viewing capable of indicating the current location of the user.

As per claims 13 and 14, Turetzky does not teach waypoints, planned route or points of interest. However, DeLorme teaches at column 10.

As per claims 15, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35 and 36, Turetzky teaches:

- providing a first handheld navigation device, the first navigation device and an integral display (column 4, lines 59-67);
- providing a second navigation device to communicate with the first navigation device, the second navigation device including one or more dead reckoning positioning components (column 4, lines 59-64 and column 3, lines 25-27);
- resolving a position of the first and the second navigation devices, wherein resolving the position includes using the one or more dead reckoning positioning components to determine the position when the triangulation positioning functionality is interrupted (column 3, lines 38-42).

The grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional (e.g. adapted to) but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Turetzky does not mention the use of triangulation. However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that any navigation system needs at least three satellites

(triangulation) to work properly in the position detection (applicant's disclosure –page 1, lines 27-28, page 2, lines 1-11, page 3, lines 18-22). Further it is obvious that the PDA used by the prior art has a display device. Turetzky does teach including the navigation data including cartographic data including a number of locations and data indicative of thoroughfares of a plurality of types. However, DeLorme teaches it at column 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to provide a portable map viewing capable of indicating the current location of the user.

As per claim 16, Turetzky does teach both devices to communicate with one another. However, DeLorme teaches it in column 8, lines 60-64. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to provide a portable map viewing capable of indicating the current location of the user.

As per claim 24, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a rate gyro or accelerometer in a navigation system in order to be more accurate (applicant's disclosure –page 10, lines 8-13).

As per claim 25, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have at least a dead reckoning including at least an odometer, a speedometer, a differential wheel sensor and a compass in order to work properly (applicant's disclosure –page 3, lines 18-22).

As per claim 27, Turetzky does not teach the PDA performing a route calculation.

However, DeLorme teaches it in abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to provide a portable map viewing capable of indicating the current location of the user.

As per claim 28, Turetzky teaches providing a handheld multifunction-device selected from a group of a PDA enabled device and a cell phone enabled device (column 4, line 59-67).

As per claim 29, it obvious to one skill in the art to use the PDA to communicate wiresly to any other device in order to provide flexibility to the user.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is 571-272-7144. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on 571-272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Olga Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2144